



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE UNITY OF THE ENCLITIC *NE*

BY ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON

More than thirty years have passed since Warren published his remarkable dissertation on the enclitic *ne*¹ in early Latin (*A.J.P.*, II [1881], 50–82). The completeness with which he justified the MS readings where these supported *ne* with demonstrative and personal pronouns in non-interrogative sentences still remains and will remain the admiration and despair of classical scholars. Such passages are Plaut. *Curc.* 139; *Epid.* 73, 541; *Mil.* 309, 565, 936; Ter. *Ad.* 770; *And.* 478; *H.T.* 950. Equally convincing to me is his discussion of *ne* in mocking responses, e.g. *egone?::tunc*, *Capt.* 857; see pp. 186–7, below.

In the second part of his paper, pp. 76–82, Warren argued that the *ne* seen in these instances was an affirmative *ne*, distinct from the interrogative *ne* (which he considered as of negative origin). This thesis, which is quite independent of the acknowledged excellences of his contribution, is open to doubt, and, accordingly, I shall consider the claims of all the varied uses of the enclitic *ne* to be regarded as having sprung from a common ancestor—the negative *ne*.²

About ten years afterward Morris published his study of the sentence-question in Plautus and Terence (*A.J.P.*, X, 397 f.; XI, 16 f., 145 f.), which of course included the use of *ne* in such questions.³

¹ The vowel of *ne* will be marked only when long.

² As a pupil of Warren, and one who, like all his pupils, has the greatest reverence for his depth and breadth and thoroughness of scholarship, as well as his soundness of judgment, I long believed almost religiously in his theory as a whole, and it was only after nearly completing my study of the exclamatory infinitive that I began to question a part of it: e.g. Ennius *Trag.* 46 R.: *hoc dolet:| mene obesse, illos prodesse; me obstare, illos obsequi!* Plaut. *Pseud.* 370–71: *numquid aliud etiam uoltis dicere?:: eequid te pudet?|:: ten amatorem esse inuentum inanem quasi cassam nucem!*

Warren disqualified these as exclamatory infinitives. I have shown elsewhere that psychologically, if not grammatically, a similar dependence holds for every exclamatory infinitive in Latin.

³ Before reading this I purposely made my own collections and classifications of *ne* in Plautus and Terence and studied the context. On reading Morris it was with great pleasure that I found my own conclusions identical with his on most of the important points. Where, after careful consideration, I differ from Morris and have confidence in my own conclusions, these will be noted on the following pages.

Morris had the great advantage of being able to avail himself of an investigation by Imme, *Die Fragesätze nach psychologischen Gesichtspunkten eingetheilt u. erläutert*, Cap. I-III, Cleve, 1879, Cap. IV-VI, 1881; the latter instalment was thus published in the same year with Warren's article, and therefore inaccessible to him. A consideration of the psychological aspects of the matter is essential to the understanding of *ne*, and so I give Imme's classification of questions, somewhat simplified to make it square with Priscian's treatment of *ne* (*GL.*, II, 101 f. K.).

I. Questions indicating doubt or open-mindedness on the part of the speaker; such questions being those asked in order to awaken interest, or to obtain information. When these use *ne* it is Priscian's interrogative or dubitative *ne*.

II. Questions indicating a definite conviction in the mind of the speaker; when *ne* is used in this kind of question it is Priscian's confirmative *ne*. These questions may be: (a) Questions of certainty, in which the speaker merely asks for the acceptance of his views: *faciuntne intellegendo ut nil intellegant?* These questions may be introduced by a confirmative (inferential) particle *ergo*, *uero*, *nempe*; cf. *οὐκοῦν*. These may develop into (b) questions of emotion, in which the speaker calls into prominence some situation that arouses his feelings, generally, but not necessarily, feelings of sadness, displeasure, e.g., Horace *C. i. 24. 5*: *ergo Quintiliū perpetuus sopor | urget?* Ter. *And. 803*: *itan Chrysis—hem! Plaut. Asin. 127*: *sicine hoc fit? foras aedibus me eici! | promerenti optume hoccin preti redditur?* cf. Ter. *Phorm. 231 f.* These are in effect exclamations. The psychological unity of questions and exclamations is of course a matter of fact, and, if further proof of this is necessary, let me call attention to the fact that in Greek the exclamatory infinitive, which has no interrogative particle, is often marked with the sign of interrogation in minuscule MSS. See especially Arist. *Aves* 5 (6), 7 (8).¹

If I may attempt to harmonize Warren's theory with Imme's classification (see above), Warren held that the purely interrogative *ne* (used in I) was of negative origin, while in II (questions of certainty and questions of emotion) the *ne* was of affirmative origin.²

¹ The credit for this discovery belongs to Professor Randolph, who on noticing the sign of interrogation in some of the MSS in this passage was started on his investigation, the results of which were published in *C.P.*, V, 309-19.

² Warren would probably not have called these questions at all.

The evidence which he presented to prove the existence of the latter is in brief as follows:

1. The evidence of grammarians, scholiasts, and glosses explaining *ne* as equivalent to *ergo*, *uero*, *enim* (Warren, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-65).

2. Statements of the grammarians and scholiasts referring to a confirmative or affirmative *ne*.

3. Passages in Plautus and Terence with *ne* can be paralleled from these authors themselves by passages of the same meaning without *ne* where the force of *ne* is expressed by such words as *uero*, *ergo*, *enim*.

4. Some supposedly cognate etymological forms: Warren, p. 76; cf. Walde, *s.v.* *ne* and *enim*, and the literature there cited.

There is no doubt that in most of the passages that Warren discussed, the *ne* has precisely the force that he said it had, but when it comes to proving etymological origins the evidence is indirect and inconclusive; e.g. (1) is largely invalidated by the fact that *an* is glossed in the same way: Servius ad Verg. *Bucol.* 3. 21; cf. Charisius, *GL.*, I, 229 K. I shall take up these various points in greater detail later as they come up in the course of my paper.¹

Let me now discuss questions indicating conviction in the mind of the speaker (II) and the treatment by ancient grammarians of passages in which they occur:

a) Questions of certainty (see p. 175) Ter. *And.* 17: *faciuntne intellegendo ut nil intellegant?* Donatus: 1. 'ne' quidam corripunt et cum interrogatione pronuntiant; quidam producunt. quorum alii 'ne' pro nonne accipiunt, i.e., non; alii 'ne' pro ualde ut (*Ad.* iv. 2. 1 [540]) 'ne ego homo sum infelix' et Cicero (*in Cat.* ii. 3. 6) 'ne illi ueh. e.' 2. *Et hoc melius, nam statim infert 'quorum aemulari*

¹ The etymological evidence for confirmative "hervorhebendes" *ne* is as follows: Latin *sin*, *donique donicum donec*, *denique*, *quandone*, "zu irgend welcher Zeit," *quin*, "irgendwie," and its compounds *alioquin*, etc.; Umbr. *arnipo*, *nersa*, *perne*; Greek *ἐγώνη*, *τύνη*, *δνε* (= *δδε*); Av. *-na* appended to interrogative pronoun, *kas-na*; O.H.G. *-na*: *ne* weist tu na "nescisne?" O.Icel. *per-na* "tibi-met." Person, "Ueber d. demonstrativen Pronominalstamm *no- ne- u.* Verwandtes," *I.F.*, II (1893), 199-260.

There are very strong reasons for doubting the identity of this pronominal stem with our enclitic *ne*; e.g., except *Trin.* 1095 *qualine*, *ne* is never attached to an interrogative pronoun in early Latin; the division *ἐγώνη*, *τύνη* deserves consideration (cf. Hirt, *Handbuch*, §§ 361, 1; 363 anm.); *quandone*, *quin* and its compounds in the senses above noted have no real support in early Latin and are probably the analogical formations of a later age, and if *sin* really were *si uero*, its use ought not to be confined to introducing the opposite, i.e. the negative, of a proposition expressed or implied in the context immediately preceding; cf. Ribbeck, *Part.*, 14 f.

exoptat n.p.q.i.o.d.' 3. Ne nimis, multum, plurimum. The view that *ne* here = the asseverative *nē* made postpositive—which D. here strangely enough accepts—is absurd, since there is no passage where the *ne* thus placed must have or even may have *ē*, and there are plenty of places where it must have *ē* or is reduced to *n*'. Cf. *H.T.* 563: uidin ego te? (glossed by Julius Rufinianus: non ego te uidi?) *Ad.* 83: dixin? *And.* 495: edixin? (glossed in Cod. Par. 7900 A by nonne dixi? and nonne edixi? respectively). Though this view may be correct enough for practical purposes, Morris has shown (*A.J.P.*, XI, 19–21) that the *nonne* effect is due quite as much to the context as to the original negative force of *ne*. These passages are questions of certainty asking an assent rather than an answer. When they use *ne* it is *ne confirmatiua*. The *locus classicus* dealing with *ne* is Priscian, *GL.*, II, 101 K.: "Dubitatiuae sunt quae dubitationem significant, ut *an*, *ne* correpta, *necne* ut Vergilius in III (39) Aeneidos 'eloquar an sileam?' idem in I (329) Aeneidos 'an Phoebi soror an Nympharum sanguinis una?' idem in XI (126) 'iustitiaene prius mirer belline laborum?' frequentissime tamen eadem interrogatiuae sunt, ut Vergilius in III (319) Aeneidos 'Hectoris Andromache Pyrrhin' conubia seruas?' idem in X (668) 'tanton' me crimine dignum?' *Haec eadem* inuenitur et *pro confirmatiua* ut Horatius in II (3. 97) sermonum 'clarus erit fortis iustus sapiensne etiam et rex.' idem in I (10. 21) 'O seri studiorum, quine putetis | difficile et mirum Rhodio quod Pitholeonti | contigit!' Terentius in *Andria*¹ † 'nuncine demum istud uerbum in te incidit.' hic enim *ne* coniunctio nec interrogatiua nec dubitatiua sed confirmatiua est. Vergilius in X (846) 'tantane me tenuit uiuendi, nate, uoluptas | ut pro me hostili paterer succumbere dextra?' | Est enim *pro etiam*."

Priscian was an authority, perhaps we might say *the* authority, on the subject, and this is shown by the intrinsic soundness of his note, as well as by the fact that he is quoted by [Acron] on Horace *S. i.* 10. 21 (see p. 184), and yet he has been flagrantly misinterpreted by the moderns, e.g., Hand, *Turs.*, IV, p. 77, and Ritter on Horace *S. ii.* 3. 97. Warren, however, took him correctly, and I shall take the liberty of

¹ Cf. 683: quaero.: hem, nuncin demum? 882: Pa. me miserum! Si. hem, modone id demum sensi, Pamphile? 883: olim istuc, . . . 885: eodem die istue uerbum uere in te accidit.

restating his interpretation with one slight variation (Horace *S. ii. 3. 97*) and with a few additions. Priscian's treatment of the interrogative and dubitative *ne* needs no comment. Then he goes on to say "*haec eadem* [i.e. *ne correpta*] inuenitur et *pro confirmatiua*." He does not allow the term *ne confirmatiua* to burst suddenly upon us, but makes the transition through the intermediate phrase *pro confirmatiua*, with confirmative force. An examination of the four passages quoted by Priscian shows that he has illustrated this use with considerable variety, and the fact that all the examples (except possibly Hor. *S. i. 10. 21*) seemed interrogative (and not confirmative) caused most scholars to conclude with undue haste that Priscian was all wrong. This of one of the great grammarians of antiquity! Regarding the first example, Hor. *S. ii. 3. 97*, [Acron] says of *sapiensne*, "*aut interrogatio audientis aut dicentis dubitatio*." If it be the latter, it is of course not confirmative, but if it be the 'interrogatio audientis' (as it is generally taken) Priscian may be justified. The Stoic, hearing the wealthy man exalted in much the same terms as those in which he was himself accustomed to exalt the wise man 'clarus erit fortis iustus' . . . , ironically injects 'sapiensne?' well knowing that Staberius would claim that distinction also, and sure enough Staberius continues, answering, 'etiam [yes indeed] et rex.' It is hardly necessary that we should require Priscian or his MSS to indicate change of speaker. As regards the Terence passage, Priscian either quoted from memory, or his MSS were corrupt. However, *And. 683* illustrates the confirmative use of *ne* with *nunc*, and *882* with *modo*. So also the Vergil passage is an emotional question.¹ Horace *S. i. 10. 21* will be discussed later under *ne* with relative pronouns. After all, then, Priscian is absolutely sound and sane. If there is anything in his note at which one might cavil, it is his "*est enim pro etiam*," and even here he is not wrong, though some of us might have preferred *ergo* or *uero* instead. Accordingly, Priscian's examples illustrate what he desired to illustrate, but his language, far from supporting a separate etymology for confirmative *ne*, is really opposed to it. It is to be noted that P. does not refer to *ne* as affirmative; the nearest he came to so doing was to use the term

¹ It is quite probable that the Vergilian quotation should come in earlier, immediately after the Terence citation.

adfirmatiua of words of which *ne confirmatiua* is in general the equivalent—*nam, enim, ergo, etiam*. That the term *adfirmatiua* is simply lax usage as applied to *ne* may be seen in [Acron's] note to Horace *S. i. 10. 21*, where he misquotes the above-quoted passage of Priscian to the extent of using the term *adfirmatiua*.¹ This shows how easily grammatical terms grew, and how cautious one must be in accepting grammatical terms as evidence to establish etymological origins.

NE WITH PRONOUNS

In his discussion of *ne* with demonstrative and with personal pronouns Morris (*A.J.P.*, X, 422–30) very properly makes the division between the purely interrogative and the emotional use of *ne*. Of the latter he says, p. 429, "They refer backward, taking up some previous idea, which may have been distinctly expressed or only implied, and repeating it in an exclamatory way, so as to suggest that it is untenable." He thus emphasizes the fact that the emotion is regularly one of dissatisfaction with the fact or the conception involved, the effect of which is repudiation. While this is undoubtedly true for the subjunctive, his generalization is not entirely correct, as he himself points out by quoting *Most. 10* and *508*, and I shall cite further instances later. Furthermore, when we realize that any of these repudiations may be expressed without *ne* and without the pronoun to which it is said to give repudiative emphasis, we must accordingly conclude that when the repudiation exists, it is the context that shows it, and we must remain open-minded to the possibility that contexts might exist in which the use of these pronouns with *ne* disclosed a situation which the speaker not only did not repudiate but in which he actually would take delight.²

¹ The statement of Cod. Par. 7610, 2d part, p. 52 (and also of Cod. Par. 7611, p. 105, and Cod. Par. 7612, p. 115): "*Ne aduerbium corripitur scilicet pro enim uel pro nonne hoc est interrogatiuum uel affirmatiuum. Dehortatiuum uero producit et coniunctio similiter*," quoted by Warren, p. 57, is sound and goes back to a good grammatical source, but in it *affirmatiuum* is used loosely for *confirmatiuum* as in the note of [Acron]. *Affirmatiuus* and *confirmatiuus* are synonymous terms, and each varies in meaning from 'corroborative' to 'affirmative.' I purposely avoid 'affirmative' in this discussion as being of a more special meaning in English, and therefore likely to mislead.

² To show how important it is to remain open-minded in this matter, let me cite the case of the exclamatory infinitive. It used to be held that this also was repudiative, and, so long as scholars held to that view, they were powerless to deal with *Phorm. 339 tene*. However, when Cic. *Tusc. i. 98 tene* and Pliny *Ep. iv. 3 hominemne* were cited,

What the *ne* does is to direct attention to, and to lay stress on, a particular word *egone*, *tune*, *hicine*, and as a result of its use in these situations the *ne* (at the expense of the interrogative function) acquired a new power, namely, that of becoming a particle of emphasis by directing the attention to the chief person or thing involved in producing the emotion. The growth of the intensive force of *ne* at the expense of its interrogative force was facilitated also by the more or less downward inflection of the voice which questions of certainty imply.

Ne WITH DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

Amph. 362: *haecine tua domust?:ita inquam.* *Rud.* 110: *isticine uos habitatis?:quid tu id quaeritas?* These two instances are purely interrogative and ask for information. The next passage illustrates the transition from interrogative to confirmative, the latter use having the help of *ergo*. *Cist.* 746: *hicine tu ergo habitas?:hariolare.*¹ Another example shows the confirmative use more clearly defined. Nausistrata, realizing the double life of her husband Chremes, and the cause of his frequent absence, exclaims (*Phorm.* 1012): *haecine erant itiones crebrae et mansiones diutinae | Lemni? haecine erat ea quae nostros minuit fructus uilitas?* In the next example recent editors have substituted (!) for (?), as indeed they might have done in many other places, including the above passage from *Phormio*. *Hec.* 282: *heu me infelicem, hancine ego uitam parsi perdere! | hacine causa ego eram tantopere cupidus redeundi domum!* The *ne* is here in exactly the same stage of development as in the exclamatory infinitive. So at the end of Callicles' splendid self-

not to speak of *Asin.* 580 and *Phorm.* 884, neither of which contained *ne*, the context came into its own. See *C.P.*, IX, 64 f. Here I may state that Warren may have been right when he defended *men*, *Eun.* 931, though I should punctuate as follows: *tum hoc alterum, | id uerost quod ego mihi puto palmarium: | men repperisse, quo modo adulescentulus | meretricum ingenia et mores posset noscere, | mature ut quom cognorit perpetuo oderit!* See the whole passage, especially 925. Now the exclamatory infinitive is interchangeable with these emotional questions in the indicative. The only difference seems to be that the exclamatory infinitive, being a substantive clause, shows greater concentration and power; cf. *Asin.* 127-28; *Ad.* 237; *Phorm.* 231-33.

¹ *Most.* 10: *em, hoccine uolebas?* is in form a question to determine Grumio's wishes, and shows the fond regard Tranio had for his feelings, and the delight he took in trying to satisfy them. *Most.* 508 *hicine percussit?*—whether spoken from within the house or by Tranio—cannot possibly be taken repudiatively. Line 516 seems to indicate that it belongs to the voice from within.

justification, *Trin.* 186: em mea malefacta, em meam auaritiam tibi, | hascine (hasce A) propter res maledicas famas ferunt!

Warren's examples show the continuation of the development of *ne*. *Epid.* 541; plane hicinest | qui mi in Epidauro uirgini primu' pudicitiam perpulit! The transition of *ne* to the subordinate clause is illustrated by *And.* 478: hicine me si inparatum in ueris nuptiis | adortus esset, quos me ludos redderet! *Hicine* was probably intended originally to be the subject of *redderet*. *Quos* came in as a slight anacoluthon, after the subordinate verb had practically appropriated *hicine*. The full development of *ne* is seen in the next two examples. *Epid.* 73: haecine ubi scibit senex, | puppis pereunda est probe. *Mil.* 309: hoccine si miles sciat, | credo hercle hos sustollat aedis totas atque hunc in crucem. Note that the *ne* comes directly before *ubi* or *si*, the latter being the usual word as will be seen more clearly in the use of *ne* with personal pronouns.

NE WITH RELATIVE PRONOUNS

At this point the use of *ne* with demonstrative adverbs and with personal pronouns would logically come up, but as the evidence bearing upon these combinations can be used with more telling effect after *ne* with relative pronouns has been treated, I digress to take up its use in combination with the relative, and that brings up the displacement of *ne* from the clause in which it strictly belongs. Cf. *Trin.* 1017: non pudet te? tribu'ne te poteriis | memoriam esse oblitum!¹ *Cas.* 117: quid tu mihi facies?: egone quid faciam tibi? the latter being a condensation of *rogasne quid ego faciam tibi?* Accordingly, the displacement of *ne* by suppressing the expression with which it really belonged was another influence to weaken its purely interrogative functions and to heighten its confirmative power to such an extent that its interrogative force might be eliminated altogether. First I shall quote the instances where the interrogative force is prominent. *Rud.* 861: quid ego deliqui?: rogas? | quin arrabonem a me accepisti ob mulierem | et eam hinc abduxti?² *Truc.* 506: peperit puerum nimium lepidum.: ehem, ecquid mei

¹ Cf. *And.* 868 f., where the *nonne* is not split.

² Cf. *Amph.* 571: *rogasne*, inprobe, etiam qui ludos facis me? Cf. *Phorm.* 156.

similest?:rogas? | quin¹ ubi natust machaeram et clupeum poscebat sibi? So probably *Bacch.* 332: sed istic Theotimus diuesne est?: etiam rogas? | quin habeat auro soccis suppactum solum? (quin Bothe, qui MSS). So probably *Mil.* 66: itane aibant tandem?: quae me ambae obsecrauerint | ut te hodie quasi pompam illa praeterducerem?

In the last two instances the subjunctive is a causal relative, "the folly of your asking, since really . . . !" *Rud.* 767: ignem magnam hic faciam.:quin inhumanum exuras tibi? "with which to burn the inhumanity out of you?"—surely a consummation devoutly to be wished. In the next three instances the *ne* is confirmative, meaning *nempe*.² *Mil.* 13: quemne ego seruauī . . . ? *Trin.* 360: quin comedit quod fuit, quod non fuit? *Truc.* 406: tonstricem Suram | nouistin nostram?:quaen erga aedem sese habet? | noui. "Of course you mean him (her) who (whom). . . ." The next instance occurs in a clause showing great surprise at something just told. *Epid.* 719: quamne hodie per urbem uterque sumus defessi quaerere? The emotion of surprise may be so strong as practically to be repudiative. So *Most.* 738: (That the wind deserted our ship) quaen subducta erat | tuto in terra? *Amph.* 697: (That she finish her sleep) quaen vigilans somniat? *Curc.* 705: (That no one carry away from you the money) quodne promisti? *Rud.* 1019: (That I let go the wallet) quemne ego excepi in mari . . . | mea opera labore et rete et horia? 1231: (That that be another's) quodne ego inueni in mari? *Phorm.* 923: (That I order the money conveyed back to you) quodne ego discipsi porro illis quibus debui?³ So with *quian*, *Most.* 1132; *Pers.* 851; possibly *Truc.* 696 (Spengel); *Cist.* 251(?); Verg. *Aen.* iv. 538; Statius *Theb.* x. 592.⁴ So with *quodne* (causal), *Merc.* 573.⁴

In the next two passages *ne* looks forward to the repudiative clause: *Mil.* 614: quodne uobis placeat⁴ displiceat mihi? Caecilius

¹ Here the *quin* might with less probability be the corroborative *quin*.

² Cf. *Epid.* 449, where Goetz conjectured *quemne* for the MSS *nempe quem*. That, however, was before Skutsch demonstrated monosyllabic *nempe*.

³ There are several passages that would gain in clearness by the addition of *ne* to the relative, e.g., Ter. *Phorm.* 69: quoin tanta erat res et supererat? cf. *Mil.* 973 (Ritschl).

⁴ Subjunctive by attraction.

147R.: (Ribbeck's probable restoration) quæen mihi quidquid placet eo priuatam it me seruata[m] uelim?¹ So *Rud.* 272: quæen eiectæ e mari simus² ambae, obsecro, | unde nos hostias agere uoluisti huc? involves a repudiation, but instead we have *unde . . . huc* used by anacoluthon as a softened form of rejection. The delicate situation *And.* 768: quemne ego heri uidi ad uos adferri uesperî? required that the repudiation should be implied and not expressed. Donatus: uult negando inritare mulierem ad confirmanda quæe uult.

In the next three instances a return is seen to the retrospective *ne*, but apart from showing that the emotion continues, it is pleonastic. Catullus 64. 180: an patris auxilium sperem quemne ipsa reliqui | respersum iuuenem fraterna caede secuta? | coniugis an fido consoler memet amore | quine fugit lentos incuruans gurgite remos? Verg. *Aen.* x. 673: quid manus illa uirum qui me meaque arma secuti, | quosne (nefas) omnes infanda in morte reliqui . . . ?

In the following instances the *ne* looks forward and would naturally have been joined to a word belonging to the main clause: *Cist.* 675: quamne in manibus tenui atque accepi hic ante aedis | cistellam, ubi ea sit nescio. There the lady is so utterly confused that she doesn't ask the question she set out to ask, and we have, as after *Rud.* 272, an anacoluthon. *Rud.* 111: quon furatum mox uenias, uestigas loca? (text Leo, an quo MSS); *Stich.* 501: quæen ipsa [or eapse] deciens in die mutat locum, | eam auspicaui ego in re capitali mea?

The next three instances show the extreme development of *ne* with relatives. They are similar to *Bacch.* 332 and *Mil.* 66 in containing subjunctives of cause with the relatives, but differ from them in that the interrogative force has passed beyond recall, and so we have a full-fledged exclamation exactly equivalent to an exclamatory infinitive except that the cause rather than the fact is made prominent. *Ad.* 262: illius opera, Sure, nunc uiuo, festiuom caput, | quin omnia sibi post putarit esse prae meo commodo! Donatus: "admiratiue additum *quin* et sic pronuntiandum—*quin*: τὸ πλῆρες *quine*." Note that *festiuom* prepares us for the exclamation of

¹ Here belong the instances of *ne* with *ut*-repudiatives: *Epid.* 225; *Merc.* 576; *Rud.* 1063; *Hec.* 66, 199; *Phorm.* 874; Horace *S.* ii. 5. 18. I cannot accept the reasoning of Morris, *A.J.P.*, XI, 176-77, that the *ut* here is interrogative.

² Subjunctive by attraction.

pleasure. Hor. *S. i.* 10. 21: O seri studiorum, quine putetis . . . ! This may be paraphrased: o seri studiorum, uosne putare. . . ! Porph.: *ne* adiectum, ut *egone, tune*; abundat *ne* syllaba: o seri stud. qui putetis.¹ . . . Note that Porph. identifies the *ne* in *quine* with the *ne* in *egone, tune* which must be taken as *egone?::tune*. The *ne* in *tune* was therefore regarded by him as a short syllable. *Cist.* 653-54: Nullam ego me uidisse credo magis anum excruciablem | quam illaec est: quae dudum fassast mihi, quae in infitias eat! Freely: "Confound the old hag, for proceeding to deny what she a little while ago 'fessed up to me!"²

NE WITH PERSONAL PRONOUNS

Above has been indicated the development of *ne* with demonstrative and relative pronouns from its purely interrogative functions to those in which it becomes a particle of emotional emphasis, conviction and assurance. The same development may be seen in its use with the personal pronouns, though some of the intermediate stages are here less clearly marked. The transition from the interrogative to the intensive uses of *ne* with personal pronouns may be seen in such passages as *Eun.* 963: hem, | obsecro, an is est? where Donatus has the following note: 'insultanter, ut in *Phorm.* (945) *ho, tune is eras?* nam sciebat ipsum esse.' While it is frankly to be admitted that both Plautus and Terence carried the interrogative-repudiative use of *egone? tune?* etc., to ridiculous lengths (Plautus himself ridiculing the practice at *Trin.* 69), still, editors have in many places been too free in introducing repudiative force into passages where the MSS give them little or no support for so doing. *Asin.* 900: (Artemona

¹ [Acron]: pro *putatisne*, uel ut sit adfirmatiua secundum Priscianum pro *etiam*. (See p. 177) *quine*: quasi *curne*: aut uacat *ne* ut *qui* pronomen sit. The moderns who, as Keller, *Epill.*, make *quine* = interrogative *curne* or who, like Schmalz, *B.P.W.* (1907), 1292, regard *quine putetis* as a contamination of *qui putetis* and *putatisne?* are wide of the mark.

² *Truc.* 534: paenitetne te quot ancillas alam, | quin examen super adducas quae mihi comedint cibum? Here *quin* is almost certainly "without" after the implied negative in *paenitetne*; but cf. Lorenz on *Most.* 738 and Warren, *op. cit.*, 81-82; *Mil.* 588: sat edepol certo scio | occisam saepe sapere plus multo suem: | quoin id adimatur ne id quod uidit uiderit. The uncertainty of the text in the last line, and the possibility of a lacuna (see Lorenz) before it, render it impossible for me to deal satisfactorily with this passage, though the expression may well mean "for verily that is taken away from her [him]."

and the parasite are eavesdropping) ARG. quid ais, pater? | ecquid matrem amas? DE. egone illam nunc amo—quia non adest. | ARG. quid quom adest? DE. periisse cupio. | PARASITE (to Art.) amat homo hic te, ut praedicat. Pareus was the first to introduce the mark of interrogation after *illam*, and he has since been universally followed. But if this were repudiative, there would be no need of the later question, *quid quom adest?* So possibly *Truc.* 898: STRAT. quid, Astaphium, litiumst? AS. merito ecastor tibi suscenset. PH. egon,¹ atque isti etiam parum | male uolo.²

Another passage where the repudiative force is doubtful is *Asin.* 884–86: egon ut non domo uxori meae | surrupiam in deliciis pallam quam habet atque ad te deferam,³ | non edepol conduci possum uita uxoris annua; *Poen.* 428: egone egone, si istuc lepide ecfexis—:i modo.: | ut non ego te hodie—:abi modo.:emittam manu— | :i modo.:non hercle meream.⁴

I come now to the passages that are surely not repudiative.

Ne attached to a word that *must* belong to the main clause—*Curc.* 139: tibine ego, si fidem seruas mecum, uineam pro aurea | statua statuam, quae tuo gutturi sit monumentum.

Ne attached to a word that may belong either to the main or to the subordinate clause: *Mil.* 936: egone hoc si ecficiam plane, | ut concubinam militis meus hospes habeat hodie | atque huic Athenas auehat, (si) hodie hunc dolum dolamus, | quid tibi ego mittam muneris! *H.T.* 950: Sed Syrum quidem egone si uiuo adeo exornatum dabo, | adeo depexum, ut dum uiuat meminerit semper mei.⁵

Ne attached to a word that belongs to a subordinate clause, though this may be due to anacoluthon: *Mil.* 565: egone si post hunc diem | muttiero, etiam quod egomet certo sciam, | dato excruciamdum me. *Ad.* 770: tun si meus esses—:dis quidem esses,

¹ Text Camerarius.

² Cf. *Curc.* 664; *H.T.* 608, 740; *Eun.* 101, 305, 778, 1026.

³ Warren, *op. cit.*, 53–54, was the first to delete (?) after *deferam*, and his view has been widely accepted.

⁴ Warren's discussion of this passage, *op. cit.*, pp. 52–53, may well entitle him to be regarded as its Oedipus.

⁵ In Warren's copy of Lindsay's Plautus, I find *Curc.* 294 thus emended: eos egon si offendero, | ex unoquoque eorum crepitum exciam polentarium. *Ne* may have been lost also from other passages, e.g., *Ter. And.* 164: quem quidem egon, si sensero . . . ; *Eun.* 989: egon te, furcifer, si uiuo. . . .

Demea, | ac tuam rem constabilisses.: :exemplo omnibus | curarem
ut esses.

The extreme use of confirmative *ne* is seen in mocking responses of the type *egone?::tune*. The juxtaposition of these two antipodal uses of *ne* has led many scholars, e.g., Morris on *Capt.* 857, to explain the echoing *ne* as the asseverative *nē* and consequently to print it divisim. Warren has shown, *op. cit.*, 70, that no metrical tests can prove that the vowel here was long. On the other hand he has pointed out that the mocking effect and rapidity of movement would be lost if it were long, and that, furthermore, MSS do not support the printing of it divisim. That the vowel of the echoing *ne* was short is confirmed by Porphyrio's note on Horace *S. i.* 10. 21 quoted on p. 184. Furthermore, the usage seems confined to Plautus, an author who was extremely fond of alliteration and echo,¹ e.g., *Pers.* 212: heia.: :beia. *Pseud.* 235: at—.: :bat, and better still the monolog *Epid.* 94 f.: at enim tu | praecaue. | at enim—bat enim! nihil est istuc. So *Rud.* 565–67, quoted by Warren (cf. *Aul.* 293–94): nemp' meae?::nemp' nescio istuc.: :qua sunt facie?::scitula. | uel ego amare utramuis possum, si probe adpotus siem. |: :nemp' puellae?::nemp' molestus es. *Curc.* 7: at tandem, tandem—.: :tandem es odiosus mihi.

The two examples with *enim* and *nempe* are particularly pertinent, as these words are among those used to show the force of confirmative *ne*. The instances are as follows: *egone?::tune*. *Capt.* 857, *Epid.* 575, *Trin.* 634, *Mil.* 439 (Ritschl). I propose the following as the correct reading for *Truc.* 586: : :inpu^dens mec^astor, Cuame, 's.: :*egone?::tune*. : :bona fide? *St.* 635: *egone?::tune*. : :mihine?::tibine. Here should be cited Warren's attractive reading of *Most.* 955: *egone?::tune*.: :tun(e) molestu's. "I forsooth?—You, forsooth! 'Sooth you are troublesome." Leo's reading of *Most.* 580: reddet^urne igitur faenus?: :reddet^urne. abi. is the nearest to the MSS *reddetur nunc abi*. At *Pers.* 220 *itanest?::itanest*.: :mala's.: :scelestu's, it would be pure folly to read the second *itanest* as an interrogative. Probably Acidalius' reading of *Truc.* 696

¹ Schrader, *De particularum 'ne' 'anne' 'nonne' ap. Plautum prosodia*, 11 n., denies that *ne* here could be enclitic, since it does not agree with his rules; but Warren, by insisting that this usage involved an echo and was therefore formulaic, had put it beyond the reach of the regular prosody of *ne*.

(*iamne* for *anne*) contains another instance of the echo: *eu edepol hominem nihili! :iamne autem ut soles? | :iamne—nihil dico.*

A very clear illustration of the development of the confirmative out of the interrogative use of *ne* is seen in connection with *satis*; cf. especially the words of Auxilium, *Cist.* 150 f.: *satin uix reliquit deo quod loqueretur loci, | ita properauit de puellae proloqui | suppositione.* See Morris, *op. cit.*, X, 434. Lists of 'affirmative' *-ne*, such as that of Mulvany in *C.R.*, IX, 15 f., are bound to be unsatisfactory, since no sharp line can be drawn between the two uses.

The above survey is intended to elucidate some of the less obvious uses of *ne* and to show the wide range through which it operated—from its purely interrogative use, which is admittedly an outgrowth of the negative, to its ultra-confirmative use which is in effect affirmative. Antipodal though these uses are, the evidence adduced above has nevertheless led me to believe that the *ne* involved is after all to be explained on the hypothesis of an original unity developing into diversity rather than an original duality with development in lines fairly distinct.

The dual theory so ably expounded by Warren has won wide acceptance, yet is by no means essential to the value of his paper. The etymological evidence in favor of affirmative *ne* is indirect, unconvincing, and fanciful. After all, "stemmata quid faciunt?" In the Brix-Niemeyer editions on *Mil.* 309, *Trin.* 129, 634, there is found along with a statement of Warren's theory a modification of it to the effect that in the confirmative use of *ne* we may have the asseverative *nē* shortened, and made postpositive and enclitic. However, the very thorough study of asseverative *nē* by Fleckeisen in *Phil.*, II. 61 f. had already made this suggestion improbable.

An attempt to prove the unity of *ne* was made by Probst, *Beiträge zur lat. Gram.*, II, 135–36, who suggested that *ne* was originally neutral, i.e., neither negative nor affirmative, but that it acquired negative or affirmative meaning, as the case might be, through association. The criticism of Morris in *A.J.P.*, XI, 172, is conclusive against this theory. "Not to dwell upon some obvious difficulties—e.g., that it does not account for the negative sense of *nī*—the theory is sufficiently condemned by the fact that it leaves the Latin language

without any negative at all until after the interrogative sentence was fully developed."

Another theory of unity is that of Glöckner, who in *ALL.*, XI, 491 f., argues that *ne* was *originally* a confirmative ("hervorhebende") particle and that its interrogative use was an outgrowth of this. Aside from the psychological considerations which may be urged against this theory, the following fact ought to make us regard it with caution: in Plautus *ne* had not yet reached a stage where it attached itself to *non* except occasionally before vowels or *h*, thus pointing to a negative origin. In Terence the combination *nonne* was beginning to come in also before consonants. See Schrader, *op. cit.*, 45. The very carefully regulated use of confirmative *ne* points toward its development from the interrogative use rather than the reverse. The fact that in early Latin *ne* is not joined with the interrogative pronoun except *Trin.* 1095 (*qualine*) is significant.

My own theory of unity is similar to that sketched by Morris, *A.J.P.*, XI, 173, footnote (his note to *Capt.* 857 seems to indicate that he did not carry his earlier theory to its logical conclusion), and sets out with negative *ne*. Through the close connection of the interrogative with the negative the particle found its way into questions. The original identity of question and exclamation and the tendency of *ne* to attach itself to an emphatic pronoun, both in questions and exclamations, developed it by association into a particle of emotional emphasis, and so it could be used with demonstrative, personal, and even with relative pronouns in sentences in which all interrogative force had been eliminated. Thus the original negative was first weakened, then neutralized,¹ then in *certain situations* it swung even beyond the neutral and acquired the confirmative force of which Priscian speaks.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

¹ Of the neutralization of a negative let me cite two clear instances:

1. *Quin* (cf. O. Kienitz: *De 'quin' particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu*. Carlsruhe [1878]), originally *qui + ne* 'why not?' 'how not?' When the force of the negative was applied retrogressively as in *Capt.* 1017: *quid tu ais? adduxtin illum huius captiuum filium?* | :: *quin inquam intus hic est*, 'Why no, I tell you, he's inside here,' *quin* developed the force of a corroborative, and so by lax usage it came to be used with the imperative, e.g., *quin tace = tace*, which was developed out of the earlier use *quin taces? = tace*.

2. *ὅκουρ* (which might be either *ὅκ ὀν* or *ὅκουρ*, see Elmsley on Eur. *Heracl.* 256) could be either *non ergo*, *non igitur* (declarative), or *nonne ergo? nonne igitur?* In the latter sense it might be written *ὅκοῦρ* meaning *ergo*, *igitur*, used not merely in inferential questions but even in answers.